



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/671,084

09/25/2003

Norman W. Finn

112025-0539

6323

24267 7590 10/19/2009
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP
88 BLACK FALCON AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02210

EXAMINER

BLANTON, JOHN D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2466

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/19/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/671,084	Applicant(s) FINN, NORMAN W.	
	Examiner JOHN BLANTON	Art Unit 2466	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims 1, 4, 14, 15, 19, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over IEEE Standards for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks: Virtual Bridged Local Area Networks (IEEE Standards for Local and Metropolitan Area

Art Unit: 2466

Networks: Virtual Bridged Local Area Networks, IEEE std. 802.1Q, 1998) (referenced as 802.1Q below in the office action) in view of IEEE Standard Part 3: Media Access Control (MAC) Bridges, IEEE std. 801.1D, 1998)(referenced as 802.1D below in the office action) and Collette et al. (US 2003/0177243) (Collette hereinafter).

For claims 1, 14, 22, and 23; 802.1Q discloses: an intermediate network device having a plurality of ports for sending and receiving network messages to and from one or more entities of a computer network at least some of which are segregated into a plurality of virtual local area network (VLANs) defined within the computer network (Figure 11-1: *illustrates the architecture of GVRP in the case of a two-Port Bridge and an end station*)(Section 11.2.1.1: *VLAN-aware bridges and end devices use the GVRP with sets of VLANs they are members of*), the intermediate network device comprising: a Generic Application Registration Protocol (GARP) VLAN Registration Protocol (GVRP) application component associated with a selected port (Section 11.2: *The GARP VLAN Registration Protocol (GVRP) defines a GARP Application that provides the VLAN registration service*), the GVRP application component having: a GARP Information Declaration (GID) component configured to maintain VLAN registration state for the selected port in response to receiving attribute events for the VLANs (Section 11.2.3.1.3: *GVRP makes use of GARP Information Declaration (GID) and GARP Information Propagation (GIP), which provide the common state machine descriptions and the common information propagation mechanisms defined for use in GARP-based applications. The GARP architecture, GID, and GIP are defined in ISO/IEC 15802-3, Clause 12. GVRP provides a mechanism for dynamic maintenance of the contents of Dynamic VLAN Registration Entries for each VLAN, and for propagating the information they contain to other Bridges. This information allows GVRP-aware devices to dynamically establish and update their knowledge of the set of VLANs that currently have active*

members, and through which Ports those members can be reached); a GVRP encoder/decoder unit (Section 11.2.3.1.2-3: *attributes and values are encoded*); and a GVRP PDU message generator, the attribute events associated with a given set of VLANs (Section 11.2.3.1.2-3: *Values of instances of the VID Attribute Type shall be encoded as Attribute Values in GARP PDUs*).

802.1Q do not disclose, but 802.1D from same fields of endeavor teach: the GVRP PDU message generator loads the encoded values computed for all of the VLANs defined within the computer network within a single GVRP PDU message for transmission from the selected port (Section 12.11.1.2: *Figure 12-6 shows the resulting GARP PDU structure with multiple Attributes*). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the GARP structure described by 802.1D in the GARP VLAN registration described by 802.1Q. The motivation is to improve inter-operability by using industry established protocols.

802.1D and 802.1Q do not expressly disclose the encoding of VLAN attributes, but 802.1D does teach the transmission of multiple messages containing attributes in a single GARP PDU (Section 12.11.1.2: *Figure 12-6 shows the resulting GARP PDU structure with multiple Attributes*), and 802.1Q does teach the generation of messages according to the GARP protocol that comprise attribute information for a plurality of different VLANs (Section 11.3.2: *Such end stations require only the ability to register membership of one or more VLANs, and revoke that membership at some later point in time*). Collette from same fields of endeavor teaches: compact information through an encoded value of a plurality of frames, in accordance with an encoding algorithm (Paragraph 35, Lines 1-

Art Unit: 2466

14: ***multiple network frames are combined into a single compressed segment and encapsulated by a compression header***). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the compression of multiple data frames as described by Collette in the GARP VLAN registration described by 802.1Q. The motivation is to reduce network bandwidth consumed by control messages by utilizing compression and combining methods well known in the art.

For claims 4 and 15, 802.1Q and Collette disclose the subject matter in claims 1 and 14 as described above in the office action.

802.1Q in combination with Collette do not disclose, but 802.1D from same fields of endeavor teach: to yield attribute event information for a set of VLANs (Section 12.3.2.2: ***the GID determines the attribute value based on the encoded value contained in the GARP PDU's for each port***). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the port description updating method described by 802.1D in the GARP VLAN registration described by 802.1Q. The motivation is to improve inter-operability by using industry established protocols.

For claim 19, 802.1Q, Collette, and 802.1D disclose the subject matter in claim 14 as described above in the office action.

802.1Q in combination with Collette do not disclose, but 802.1D from same fields of endeavor teach: a port partner variable configured to hold a source identifier (Section 12.2: ***The set of registrations of a given Attribute value within the Bridged LAN can therefore be considered to form a set of subtrees***), wherein upon processing a received GVRP message containing a negotiation message with a source identifier the compact GVRP

application component places the source identifier in the port partner variable (Section 12.2: *each indicating, from a given GARP Participant, the subset of the active topology in which all GARP Participants that have declared that Attribute value can be found. In Figure 12-3, Ports that form this set of subtrees are shown as the origin of the arrows, based on the registrations that are shown in Figure 12-2.*). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement GARP protocol as described by 802.1D in the GARP VLAN registration described by 802.1Q. The motivation is to use standard protocols for registering of attributes.

5. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 802.1Q, 801.1D, and Collette as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Huang (US 4,281,391).

For claim 2, 802.1Q, 802.1D, and Collette disclose the subject matter in claim 1 as described above in the office action.

802.1Q, 802.1D, and Collette do not disclose, but Huang from same fields of endeavor teaches: the encoding algorithm is a number based conversion algorithm (Column 34, Lines 59-64: *dividing this by the same number to form a new equation is known as Euclid's base conversion algorithm*). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement an encoding calculation as described by Huang in the GARP VLAN registration described by 802.1Q. The motivation is to reduce network bandwidth consumed by control messages.

For claim 3, 802.1Q, 802.1D, Collette, and Huang disclose the subject matter in claim 2 as described above in the office action.

Huang discloses using the base conversion algorithm, but does not explicitly disclose using the algorithm with a base of 5. However, the base conversion algorithm is generating a pointer to the entries of the Attribute Event Codes, and there are 5 entries in the table (Refer to Applicant's Figure 6). Therefore, the optimum base value required to point to all entries is 5. Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement an encoding calculation as described by Huang using a base value of 5. The motivation is to distinctly reference all values in the Attribute table with smallest possible hashing value.

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 802.1Q, 801.1D, and Collette as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Churchyard et al. (US 7,089,302) (hereinafter Churchyard).

For claim 5, 802.1Q, 802.1D, and Collette disclose the subject matter in claim 1 as described above in the office action.

802.1Q, 802.1D, and Collette do not disclose, but Churchyard from same fields of endeavor teach: generate and send a GVRP PDU containing a just_kidding message (Column 4, Lines 65-67: ***nodes not capable of decoding the message will read the header field and not recognize the field entry; this will cause the message to be ignored; this is the intent of the just kidding message, so nodes that don't understand the compact GVRP format will not get corrupted*** – Note the claim language does not clearly define what a just_kidding message's function is, therefore the interpretation of the just_kidding message reads on any message generated in a GVRP PDU). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement a non-standard field value as described by

Art Unit: 2466

Churchyard in the GARP VLAN registration described by 802.1Q. The motivation is to prevent node configuration lock-ups.

7. Claims 6-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 802.1Q, 801.1D, Collette, and Churchyard as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Rodeheffer et al. (US 2005/0036500) (hereinafter Rodeheffer).

For claim 6, 802.1Q, 802.1D, Collette, and Churchyard disclose the subject matter in claim 5 as described above in the office action.

802.1Q do not disclose, but 802.1D from same fields of endeavor teach: a leave timer (Section 12.7.4: *each registrar per attribute comprises a leave timer*); state machines associated with each GID (Section 12.3.2: *each instance of GID consists of a set of state machines for each attribute value associated with the GARP*); state machine starts the leave timer (Section 12.7.4: *the registrar starts the leave timer*) while the leave all timer is restarted (Section 12.7.6: *when the another participant receives a leave all message the participant generates a restart timer message*). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement GARP protocol as described by 802.1D in the GARP VLAN registration described by 802.1Q. The motivation is to prevent node configuration lock-ups.

802.1D does not disclose the additional message “just kidding” which causes non-compliant nodes to ignore the compact GVRP message disclosed in claim 1, but Churchyard does disclose using an additional field that non-compliant nodes would ignore which reads on a “just kidding” message. Thus it would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2466

the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement state machines and timers as described by 802.1D as applied to the additional "just kidding" message described by Churchyard. The motivation is to use the 802.1D standard to any variable or state machines added to the existing protocol.

802.1D does not disclose the additional message "just kidding" which causes non-compliant nodes to ignore the compact GVRP message disclosed in claim 1, but Churchyard does disclose using an additional field that non-compliant nodes would ignore which reads on a "just kidding" message. Rodeheffer from similar fields of endeavor teaches: initiating a plurality of timers where the one time is started to confirm the response from other devices (Paragraph 121, Lines 1-8: ***This timer is started in step 624 when the entry associated with a slave is added to the inventory. The timer is restarted (refreshed) in step 626 each time the slave confirms its acceptance. If a slave fails to confirm its acceptance, eventually the slave's entry timer expires. When an entry timer expires, step 630, the entry associated with the slave is removed from the inventory*** - Note the claim language does not clearly define what a just_kidding message's function is or how the timers functions relative to the messages therefore the interpretation of the timers read on any plurality of timers). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the watchdog timer after sending of the just kidding message for determining node acceptance. The motivation is to prevent the sending node from locking up due non-responsive nodes.

For claim 7, 802.1Q, Collette, 802.1D, and Churchyard disclose the subject matter in claim 6 as described above in the office action.

802.1Q in combination with Collette do not disclose, but 802.1D from same fields of endeavor teach: a leave_all timer; and a leave_all state machine, wherein upon expiration of the leave_all timer the leave_all state machine enters an active state (Section 12.7.6: *leave all messages are generated by the leave all state machine*) and the compact-GVRP application component generates and sends a GVRP PDU message that is configured to cause network entities that receive it to respond with one or more GVRP PDU messages (Section 12.7.6: *when the leave all timer expires, a leave all message is generated; this requires all applicants to respond with a rejoin*). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement GARP protocol as described by 802.1D in the GARP VLAN registration described by 802.1Q. The motivation is to prevent node configuration lock-ups.

For claim 8, 802.1Q, Collette, 802.1D, and Churchyard disclose the subject matter in claim 7 as described above in the office action.

802.1Q in combination with Collette do not disclose, but 802.1D from same fields of endeavor teach: the leave timer (Section 12.7.4: *each registrar per attribute comprises a leave timer*); leave_all timer (Section 12.7.6: *when the leave all timer expires, a leave all message is generated; this requires all applicants to respond with a rejoin*). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to assign timer preset values so the participant will not time out when responding to a leave all message with a join message as described by 802.1D in the GARP VLAN registration described by 802.1Q. The motivation is to prevent node configuration lock-ups.

802.1D does not disclose the additional message “just kidding” which causes non-compliant nodes to ignore the compact GVRP message disclosed in claim 1, but Churchyard does disclose using an additional field that non-compliant nodes would ignore which reads on a “just kidding” message. Rodeheffer from similar fields of endeavor teaches: initiating a plurality of timers where the one time is started to confirm the response from other devices (Paragraph 121, Lines 1-8: ***This timer is started in step 624 when the entry associated with a slave is added to the inventory. The timer is restarted (refreshed) in step 626 each time the slave confirms its acceptance. If a slave fails to confirm its acceptance, eventually the slave's entry timer expires. When an entry timer expires, step 630, the entry associated with the slave is removed from the inventory.***). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the watchdog timer after sending of the just kidding message for determining node acceptance. The motivation is to prevent the sending node from locking up due non-responsive nodes.

For claim 10, 802.1Q, Collette, 802.1D, and Churchyard disclose the subject matter in claim 7 as described above in the office action.

802.1Q in combination with Collette do not disclose, but 802.1D from same fields of endeavor teach: a port partner variable configured to hold a source identifier (Section 12.2: ***The set of registrations of a given Attribute value within the Bridged LAN can therefore be considered to form a set of subtrees***), wherein upon processing a received GVRP message containing a negotiation message with a source identifier the compact GVRP application component places the source identifier in the port partner variable (Section 12.2: ***each indicating, from a given GARP Participant, the subset of the active topology in which***

all GARP Participants that have declared that Attribute value can be found. In Figure 12-3, Ports that form this set of subtrees are shown as the origin of the arrows, based on the registrations that are shown in Figure 12-2.). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement GARP protocol as described by 802.1D in the GARP VLAN registration described by 802.1Q. The motivation is to use standard protocols for registering of attributes.

8. Claims 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 802.1Q, Collette, Churchyard, Rodeheffer, and 801.1D as applied to claims 7 and 14 above, and further in view of Liu (US 2004/0061773) and Uchida et al. (US 2004/0076130) (hereinafter Uchida).

For claims 9 and 18, 802.1Q, Collette, 802.1D, and Churchyard disclose the subject matter in claims 7 and 16 as described above in the office action.

802.1Q in combination with Collette do not disclose, but Liu from same fields of endeavor teaches: a multi mode operation and the automatic transfer from one mode to another based on the received signal (Paragraph 38: *the two modes, digital and analog, read on the slow and fast modes; further the device has a function to automatically switch between the modes, this reads on the mode select unit switching from compact to normal GVRP modes*). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the multi mode switching method as described by Liu in the GARP VLAN registration described by 802.1Q. The motivation is to efficiently process all messages.

802.1Q in combination with Collette do not disclose, but Uchida from same fields of endeavor teaches: a tri-mode system that changes based on the received signal (Paragraph 10: *need for an apparatus and method to account for the addition of the GSM mode, so that the tri-mode (AMPS, CDMA, and GSM) wireless telephone can effectively attempt to acquire service in a particular geographic region*). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the initiate the switching method as described by Uchida in the GARP VLAN registration described by 802.1Q. The motivation is to efficiently process all messages.

9. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 802.1Q, Collette, Churchyard, Rodeheffer, and 801.1D as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Liu.

For claim 11, 802.1Q, Collette, Churchyard, Rodeheffer, and 801.1D disclose the subject matter in claim 10 as described above in the office action.

802.1Q in combination with Collette do not disclose, but Liu from same fields of endeavor teaches: a received GVRP message containing a negotiation message with a source identifier that does not match the content of the port partner variable (Paragraph 38: *a signal received that is not compatible with the current mode of reception will initiate an automatic switch to the other mode*), the compact GVRP application enters the slow compact mode (Paragraph 38: *the mode switch to reads on going to the slow mode which can be interpreted as the mode to handle standard GVRP messages*). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the

dual mode switching method as described by Liu in the GARP VLAN registration described by 802.1Q. The motivation is to efficiently process all messages.

For claim 12, 802.1Q, Collette, 802.1D, and Churchyard disclose the subject matter in claim 10 as described above in the office action.

802.1Q in combination with Collette do not disclose, but Liu from same fields of endeavor teaches: processing a received GVRP message containing a negotiation message with a source identifier that matches the content of the port partner variable (Paragraph 38: *a signal received that is not compatible with the current mode of reception will initiate an automatic switch to the other mode*), the compact GVRP application enters the fast compact mode (Paragraph 38: *the mode switch to reads on going to the fast mode which can be interpreted as the mode to handle compact GVRP messages*). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the dual mode switching method as described by Liu in the GARP VLAN registration described by 802.1Q. The motivation is to efficiently process all messages.

10. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 802.1Q, Collette, and 801.1D as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Davis et al. (US 2003/0043806) (hereinafter Davis) and Gharachorloo et al. (US 2002/0087806) (hereinafter Gharachorloo).

For claim 13, 802.1Q, 802.1D, and Collette disclose the subject matter in claim 1 as described above in the office action.

802.1Q do not disclose, but 802.1D from same fields of endeavor teach: the fields loaded with the encoded values (Section 12.11.1.2: ***Figure 12-6 shows the resulting GARP PDU structure with multiple Attributes***). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the GARP structure described by 802.1D in the GARP VLAN registration described by 802.1Q. The motivation is to improve inter-operability by using industry established protocols.

802.1Q, 802.1D, and Collette do not disclose, but Davis from same fields of endeavor teaches: generate a mixed format PDU message (Paragraph 35, Lines 1-6: ***multiple IP packets are placed in the same PDU and the recipient is able to distinguish the different packets***). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the multi segment PDU as described by Davis in the GARP VLAN registration described by 802.1Q. The motivation is to reduce network bandwidth consumed by control messages.

802.1Q in combination with Collette do not disclose, but Gharachorloo from same fields of endeavor teaches: a vector message (Paragraph 195, Lines 15-19: ***a data directory structure using a coarse vector format***). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the vector pointer structure as described by Gharachorloo in the GARP VLAN registration described by 802.1Q. The motivation is to reduce network bandwidth consumed by control messages.

Art Unit: 2466

11. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 802.1Q, 801.1D, and Collette as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Churchyard and Rodeheffer.

For claim 16, 802.1Q, 802.1D, and Collette disclose the subject matter in claim 14 as described above in the office action.

802.1Q do not disclose, but 802.1D from same fields of endeavor teach: a leave timer (Section 12.7.4: *each registrar per attribute comprises a leave timer*); state machines associated with each GID (Section 12.3.2: *each instance of GID consists of a set of state machines for each attribute value associated with the GARP*); state machine starts the leave timer (Section 12.7.4: *the registrar starts the leave timer*) while the leave all timer is restarted (Section 12.7.6: *when the another participant receives a leave all message the participant generates a restart timer message*). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement GARP protocol as described by 802.1D in the GARP VLAN registration described by 802.1Q. The motivation is to prevent node configuration lock-ups.

802.1D does not disclose the additional message "just kidding" which causes non-compliant nodes to ignore the compact GVRP message disclosed in claim 1, but Churchyard does disclose using an additional field that non-compliant nodes would ignore which reads on a "just kidding" message. Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement state machines and timers as described by 802.1D as applied to the additional "just kidding"

Art Unit: 2466

message described by Churchyard. The motivation is to use the 802.1D standard to any variable or state machines added to the existing protocol.

802.1D does not disclose the additional message “just kidding” which causes non-compliant nodes to ignore the compact GVRP message disclosed in claim 1, but Churchyard does disclose using an additional field that non-compliant nodes would ignore which reads on a “just kidding” message. Rodeheffer from similar fields of endeavor teaches: initiating a plurality of timers where the one time is started to confirm the response from other devices (Paragraph 121, Lines 1-8: ***This timer is started in step 624 when the entry associated with a slave is added to the inventory. The timer is restarted (refreshed) in step 626 each time the slave confirms its acceptance. If a slave fails to confirm its acceptance, eventually the slave's entry timer expires. When an entry timer expires, step 630, the entry associated with the slave is removed from the inventory.***). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the watchdog timer after sending of the just kidding message for determining node acceptance. The motivation is to prevent the sending node from locking up due non-responsive nodes.

For claim 17, 802.1Q, Collette, 802.1D, and Churchyard disclose the subject matter in claim 16 as described above in the office action.

802.1Q in combination with Collette do not disclose, but 802.1D from same fields of endeavor teach: a leave_all timer; and a leave_all state machine, wherein upon expiration of the leave_all timer the leave_all state machine enters an active state (Section 12.7.6: ***leave all messages are generated by the leave all state machine***) and the compact-GVRP application component generates and sends a GVRP PDU message

Art Unit: 2466

that is configured to cause network entities that receive it to respond with one or more GVRP PDU messages (Section 12.7.6: *when the leave all timer expires, a leave all message is generated; this requires all applicants to respond with a rejoin*). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement GARP protocol as described by 802.1D in the GARP VLAN registration described by 802.1Q. The motivation is to prevent node configuration lock-ups.

12. Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 802.1Q, Collette, and 801.1D as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Liu.

For claim 20, 802.1Q, Collette, and 801.1D disclose the subject matter in claim 19 as described above in the office action.

802.1Q in combination with Collette do not disclose, but Liu from same fields of endeavor teaches: a received GVRP message containing a negotiation message with a source identifier that does not match the content of the port partner variable (Paragraph 38: *a signal received that is not compatible with the current mode of reception will initiate an automatic switch to the other mode*), the compact GVRP application enters the slow compact mode (Paragraph 38: *the mode switch to reads on going to the slow mode which can be interpreted as the mode to handle standard GVRP messages*). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the dual mode switching method as described by Liu in the GARP VLAN registration described by 802.1Q. The motivation is to efficiently process all messages.

For claim 21, 802.1Q, Collette, and 801.1D disclose the subject matter in claim 19 as described above in the office action.

802.1Q in combination with Collette do not disclose, but Liu from same fields of endeavor teaches: processing a received GVRP message containing a negotiation message with a source identifier that matches the content of the port partner variable (Paragraph 38: *a signal received that is not compatible with the current mode of reception will initiate an automatic switch to the other mode*), the compact GVRP application enters the fast compact mode (Paragraph 38: *the mode switch to reads on going to the fast mode which can be interpreted as the mode to handle compact GVRP messages*). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the dual mode switching method as described by Liu in the GARP VLAN registration described by 802.1Q. The motivation is to efficiently process all messages.

Conclusion

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2466

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHN BLANTON whose telephone number is (571)270-3933. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30AM to 5:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Ryman can be reached on (571) 272-3152. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/671,084
Art Unit: 2466

Page 21

/J. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 2466

/Daniel J. Ryman/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2466